

**MINUTES OF THE 1st SCRUTINY MEETING OF THE
WEST CUMBRIA SITES STAKEHOLDER GROUP
HELD AT WHITEHAVEN CIVIC HALL
ON THURSDAY 06 OCTOBER 2005**

Present:

Mr J Murdock	-	GMB Union
Mr P Shawcross	-	Prospect
Mr L Shepherd	-	Allerdale Borough Council
Dr J Vickers	-	North Cumbria Primary Care Trust
Prof S Jones	-	Westlakes Research Institute
Mr R Hargreaves	-	St John's Parish Council
Mrs L McDevitte	-	St Bridgets Parish Council
Mr D Cook	-	Drigg Parish Council
Cllr S Brown	-	Cumbria County Council
Mr A Mayall	-	Environment Agency
Mr P Mann	-	UKAEA
Cllr E Woodburn	-	Copeland Borough Council
Mr D Moore	-	Chairman
Ms S Williams	-	British Nuclear Group
Prof J Haywood	-	Regional Medical Physics
Mr P Lutwyche	-	British Nuclear Group
Mr D Haynes	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr R Mrowicki	-	Nuclear Decommissioning Authority
Mr M Dixon	-	NDA
Dr D Lacey	-	Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
Ms Z Bergmann	-	Copeland Borough Council
Mr N Clarkson	-	Cumbria County Council
Dr P McKenna	-	Isle of Man Government
Cllr T Johnston	-	Copeland Borough Council
Cllr Carni McCarron-Holmes	-	Allerdale Borough Council
Mr D Humphreys	-	Cumbria County Council Emergency Planning
Mr B McNichol	-	Cumbria Fire Service

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

1. The Chairman welcomed everyone to the first scrutiny meeting of the West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group, he pointed out that there were no planned fire drills and explained that should the alarm sound there were 4 exits in the hall and the roll call area was in the car park.
2. He asked everyone to sign the register that was provided to account for everyone in the event of a role call.
3. The Chairman started the meeting by explaining how he would like the new format to work. Members had been sent letters explaining that a Chairman's sub committee had been held to discuss the format of the main scrutiny meetings, the main change being the length of time taken to present reports at the meetings. He explained that it would exclude the NDA who

would have a longer timescale as the 'NDA Strategy' had been chosen as a key discussion area.

4. He asked presenters to highlight only one or two items from the report or to report on anything that had happened since the distribution of the report. The reports had been distributed in adequate time for members to read and had been available on the website, in local libraries and local council offices.
5. Another change that had been introduced was that at each main meeting the Chairman or the Chairman's sub committee would identify a key area where a more in depth presentation would be required. On this occasion the NDA strategy had been decided upon and the Chairman was delighted that David Hayes of the NDA had attended the meeting in order to present the strategy.
6. The Chairman welcomed all observers to the meeting and reminded members to sign the register being circulated around the table.

AGENDA ITEM 1 - APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

7. Moving onto agenda item 1, the Chairman reported that a number of members had been unable to attend the meeting and had sent representatives, the Chairman welcomed all the representatives to the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 2 – MINUTES OF 95th MEETING, HELD ON 07 APRIL 2005

8. Moving onto agenda item 2, the Chairman asked if there were any amendments or matters arising from the minutes of the 95th meeting (and last meeting) of the SLLC.

9. AGENDA ITEM 3 – MATTERS ARISING FROM MINUTES OF 95th MEETING

10. There were no matters arising.

AGENDA ITEM 4 – TRANSITION FROM SLLC TO WCSSG (PROGRESS MADE)

11. The Chairman began his presentation by reporting that all members had been circulated a collection of logos for their preference, the responses enabled the committee to choose the logo that was identified as the most popular.
12. He explained that the new website was up and running and commented that it was up to date, very easy to use and had all the information that members would need, the website was also set up to enable anyone to register their interest in the consultations that the committee would be running. He explained that it was a very 'fit for purpose' website and saw it as being the main tool for the committee to liaise with the community. The Chairman asked people to use the website wherever possible - www.wcssg.co.uk
13. Moving on, he highlighted that the Community Engagement co-ordinating sub committee had identified 'The Future of Sellafield' as the first consultation to be launched and that it would be posted onto the website in October.
14. The Chairman reported that all the meetings of the committee had in the past been advertised in the press which was very expensive. He explained that there had been a calendar of events created which members had received and copies were available at the meeting for members of the public. The calendar of events would be advertised in the press

on a 6 monthly basis which would eliminate the need to advertise every meeting in the press and so save on costs. The Chairman explained that they would also be placed in local libraries for members of the public to acquire.

15. Moving on he explained that the committee had held the Maryport 'Drop-in' evening as the format for the July event. He asked members to provide the secretariat with any ideas of what they would like to include in the meeting format for January 06.
16. **Q: Martin Forward:** Mr Forwood asked the Chairman why there was not a sub committee for Sellafield given that there was one for the Calder Hall site, UKAEA site and LLW at Drigg site.
17. **A: Chairman:** The Chairman explained that when deciding on how to set up the sub committees the Sellafield site was identified has having several aspects to it, ie: operational aspects and decommissioning aspects, it was felt that it would be best dealt with at the main meeting. The Chairman also reflected on the fact that the other sites were put into packages based on how the NDA would be putting them out to tender. The Chairman did however stress that the committee was open to any suggestions for change and if people felt there was a need for a Sellafield sub committee then the committee would look at it.
18. **AGENDA ITEM 5 – NDA STRATEGY**
19. The Chairman explained that the key discussion item for the meeting was the NDA strategy and pointed out that the Community Engagement Co-ordinating sub committee was drafting up a response to the strategy. Copeland Borough Council had offered to collate the information. Any questions asked at the meeting would also be feed into the response along with any comments the community wished to submit to the committee.
20. The response would be compiled by the WCSSG assisted by Copeland Borough Council and would be circulated to all members prior to the submission to the NDA.
21. The Chairman invited Mr David Hayes to present the NDA strategy.
22. Mr Hayes began his presentation by explaining that it was the NDA's first strategy, as although its presence had been advertised for a few months before formal establishment on the 1st April, it was a fairly new organisation.
23. He continued that it was a fairly significant challenge to produce a first draft strategy some four or five months into existence and hoped that what was produced would be of interest and that there would be aspects of it that the community would actually agree with.
24. The NDA mission is to deliver a world class programme of safe, cost effective accelerated and environmentally friendly responsible decommissioning of its nuclear legacy with due regard to social and economic factors and in an open and transparent way.
25. Mr Hayes proposed to touch very briefly the NDA's key aims for the next five years or so. He reported that a fundamental starting point was to create robust, properly costed, properly funded, properly scheduled plans for the clean up of nuclear sites based on a comprehensive understanding of its liabilities. The NDA has to fully scope, cost and schedule the work that has to be undertaken at each of its sites to the best degree possible so it gains a real understanding of the work that needs to be done at each of the sites over their lifetimes.

26. Secondly to demonstrate real progress in reducing the high hazard, the potential high hazards in the legacy facilities, particularly at Sellafield but also at the Dounreay site.
27. Thirdly to introduce competitions for the management and operation of NDA sites, to agree a better approach to waste management in particular for intermediate level waste and low level waste, to bring forward the timescales for decommissioning the Magnox reactor sites and finally to define the end dates for when NDA can make the sites it has available for alternative use to the communities in which they reside. Mr Hayes reported that they were the top priorities for the next five years.
28. Over the medium term within the next 25 years NDA hopes to have all the Magnox stations cleared and made available for alternative use with final clearance hopefully achieved at a number of other NDA sites, Harwell, Winfrith, Culham and Capenhurst.
29. Recognising that it would be challenging, the NDA would hope to decommission the plants and facilities at Sellafield within 75 years currently projected to take quite a while longer than that, Mr Hayes commented that it was an aspirational target rather than anything else.
30. In the strategy document NDA has set out a clear structure to the strategy looking at a number of issues in turn, decommissioning and clean up, waste management and competition.
31. With regards to decommissioning and clean-up, Mr Hayes reported that there were three priorities, the first is to make real progress to reduce potential high hazard especially at Sellafield and NDA has asked British Nuclear Group at Sellafield to produce detailed plans for cleaning up the legacy ponds and silos at Sellafield. NDA hope to have the results of that work near the end of November.
32. The second priority is to accelerate the decommissioning of the Magnox sites. Under current policies Mr Hayes reported that it will take something like 85 – 125 years to clean up those sites. NDA believe that there are real benefits in terms of overall costs and in terms of keeping the current workforce engaged in employment on those sites if it can bring forward the clean-up of the sites to something like 25 years or less, that would follow practice in countries like Japan and France where there are examples of cleaning up sites on those timescales. He continued that it would be crucially dependent on waste disposal routes available.
33. The third priority is that the NDA want to engage in a process through the site stakeholder groups to agree determinations on what the final end states and end dates should be for each of its sites. Only once the NDA has the agreement of the community as to what the end states and end dates should be will the NDA actually have a very clear route to agreeing what the critical milestones are on the way towards achieving those end states.
34. In terms of waste management NDA very much want to reduce the cost in this area. NDA believe that the LLW repository at Drigg is too expensive to operate and it believes that the site does not have the capacity to deal with all the projected arisings of LLW therefore the LLW repository at Drigg is not the answer going forward. Mr Hayes reported that the NDA want to carry out further work on looking at what the best option would be for the UK in terms of LLW management, for example whether it is storing such waste on the sites, whether to create another national or regional repository for that waste, whether there are other options, whether the LLW repository at Drigg should be used in future just for non nuclear waste such as that coming from hospitals, those are all options that NDA wish to

consider over the coming months. NDA has to do that bearing in mind that there is a very important consultation which is due to be launched by the Department of the Environment very shortly on UK LLW policy so it needs to ensure that the work it is doing does not get out of step with that other wider, legitimate public consultation.

35. Continuing, Mr Hayes commented that NDA need to take early decisions on interim storage issues around Intermediate Level Waste and again he highlighted that there is a massive Government exercise underway through the committee on radioactive waste management to determine what the long term waste management solution should be for ILW and HLW that committee is due to reach its conclusions by Summer 06 along the same time frame as the Governments review on LLW policy, the conclusions of that will be massively important to the NDA in taking its work forward. NDA has expressed to the committee on Radioactive waste management its own present preference for a deep geological repository but has said nothing in its strategy about what its preferences are or for where such a repository might be located, Mr Hayes commented that he did not believe that was appropriate at the moment. He also commented that the work of CORWM is fundamental to NDA, and it is vital that the UK has a long term management solution available, NDA has made it clear to Government that if such a waste management solution can be available for implementation within 25 years, ie: about 2030 it offers a real possibility to move the intermediate level waste from the Magnox sites that is being stored on an interim basis straight to the deep hole in the ground or whatever solution the Government decides to go for.
36. NDA also in that regard wants to look at what the best solutions might be for interim storage facilities, for example, issues about whether such waste is best stored on the sites, whether waste is stored in a number of regional repositories or whether there is a number of, or one national repository, Sellafield, Dounreay or perhaps one of the Southern sites occupied by the UKAEA would be the favourites for that and NDA want to look at the options.
37. In terms of commercial operations NDA want to run the assets that it has as efficiently and effectively as it can and maximise the income from those operations as much as it can. Mr Hayes reported that the NDA has a budget of £2 billion pounds per year, half of the budget comes from its commercial operations the other £1 billion pounds comes from the treasury. It is important that NDA run the commercial operations as effectively as it can in order to reduce the burden on the tax payer.
38. NDA want to look at commercial opportunities in particular around sites like Springfields and Capenhurst in order to look at the opportunities for further business there.
39. Moving on Mr Hayes reported that NDA is looking at what the best approach to Thorp and the Sellafield MOX plant should be, the Thorp plant is currently closed because of the spillage issues earlier in the year. NDA will provide advice to Government on the technical, economic and other issues around the continued operation of Thorp. The nuclear regulators provide their own report on the incident at the Sellafield site and that will emerge in due course.
40. On the Sellafield MOX plant Mr Hayes stated that the main area for consideration is whether the plant can ramp up to a viable production capacity, some good progress has been made there in recent weeks and months in terms of making the first fuel assemblies available to overseas customers. The plant is still in the commissioning phase and the issue is whether it can increase production to sustainable levels.

41. Moving on, Mr Hayes reported that there are a number of issues NDA want to discuss with Government in terms of the management of nuclear materials, in particular the big issue is whether materials like Plutonium should be regarded as having some sort of strategic value, for example in the manufacture of nuclear fuel under a new build programme, or whether it should be regarded as a waste and therefore a liability with the attendant financial consequences for the NDA budget. If it were to be regarded as a liability, NDA think the cost would be about another five or ten billion pounds on its balance sheet which is a significant issue.
42. Another key issue for the NDA is its competition schedule, in the strategy it set out its own current thinking on what that competition schedule should be, a first competition in 2006 around LLW in particular competing out the management and the operation of the LLW facility at Drigg with a view to awarding the contract at the back end of 2006.
43. Mr Hayes reported that there are two parallel competitions with a view to awarding contracts at the end of 2007 for two Magnox packages, one for the Northern half of the UK and one for the Southern half of the UK.
44. Two packages would be competed around the UKAEA sites in 2008, one for Dounreay and one for Harwell and Winfrith.
45. Mr Hayes reported that NDA did not intend at the moment to compete the Sellafield Site until around 2009 – 2010, or intend to compete Oldbury and Wylfa, the two remaining Magnox generating stations until they finish generation respectively in 2008, 2010, so NDA want to look more at the commercial opportunities around the Springfield site, whether it has the best balance of decommissioning and commercial activity there and whether it makes sense to compete the site or not.
46. Similarly if NDA clean up Capenhurst site effectively within the next five years or so it may not make sense to compete that site so it may want to re-assess that. It may also want to look at the Culham site in the South of England currently being used for the European fusion project because again while that work is ongoing currently into the next decade it doesn't seem sensible for NDA to compete that site.
47. Mr Hayes continued that the schedule is not definite at the moment NDA is attracting a number of views on it and some people think the bundling should be different. NDA is looking forward to receiving views from the community on whether it thinks NDA has it right.
48. NDA also has a remit for developing things like skills, research and development, promulgating best practice and is working hard with other people to develop things like a nuclear skills institute based in West Cumbria, a national Nuclear Skills Academy and with Government and others on what a national research laboratory might look like.
49. NDA also wishes to establish a national nuclear archive to ensure all the information currently available is not lost for the benefit of the nation and other issues around that. The NDA are hoping to turn those aspirations into reality over the coming weeks.
50. In terms of financial issues, Mr Hayes commented that NDA currently estimate that the cost of dealing with its liabilities is some £56 billion pound based on life cycle baselines from last year. It is currently reviewing those life cycle baselines for all of its sites at the moment to establish new figures. Mr Hayes anticipated that the number would go up from the current

figure but there is no evidence to support that yet. NDA will be making those life cycle baselines available towards the end of November - end of the year for public consumption.

51. Mr Hayes went on to report that the Government has set NDA a target to reduce the overall cost of liabilities by 10% by the end of financial year 2010, Mr Hayes commented that NDA is working hard to achieve that. The Government also wants NDA to achieve 2% annual reductions in efficiency savings from its main contractors, beginning next year (06), that process has been started already. NDA has asked its contractors BNG, UKAEA and Westinghouse to make 7% efficiency savings this year and 5% for each of the next two years and they are all making very good progress with that, Mr Hayes reported that the purpose was not to drive money out of decommissioning clean up but to make savings to put back into the programme and NDA is planning to incentivise its contractors even more to achieve the savings and to spend the money so that the total pot of money is available for real clean up work.
52. NDA is also looking currently at the re-allocation of funding around its sites at the start of the financial year NDA set each of its sites annual funding limits at which they were asked to adhere to, those set the funding ceilings for each of the sites, NDA has been reviewing the sites performance of spending that money in recent weeks and it expects to announce over the next week or so how it might re-allocate the funding, this is to ensure that in the first financial year NDA is actually spending 100% of its money across the UK rather than 85 or 90%.
53. Moving to talk about socio and economic development Mr Hayes commented that it was very important to NDA and it was looking again in more detail at ways it can continue to support and develop that, it has two mechanisms primarily at the moment, the first to continue to work with its contractors through its contracts to give the money under the near term work plans to fund local support through its contracts, it is also looking at how the NDA can work with other partners to promote socio and economic development on a more strategic and more national basis primarily in areas like skills and research and development again to ensure that that money is available from the NDA to fund such activity. The money will primarily be used as a seed corn to fund wider initiatives with other partners for example providing matched funding to help get projects off the ground.
54. Mr Hayes mentioned that at the same time as putting out the strategy NDA also carried out an environmental assessment of the strategy which is required under European legislation but which the NDA would have wanted to carry out in any case. When the NDA had its first ideas on the strategy it went out to all of its 20 sites, carried out an environmental report of those sites and reflected the conclusions of that work back into the strategy which highlighted a number of key issues, issues around the amount of contaminated land on some of its sites, especially Sellafield, the potential effects of climate change and coastal erosion on some of its sites including the LLW repository at Drigg and issues around waste management and transport obviously has environmental implications as does the impact on people and therefore the socio economic dimension. The NDA therefore factored those issues into the strategy in coming up with the conclusions that it has and issues like contaminated land, like coastal erosion, like potential climate change will obviously be a key factor in the discussions that are held about the site end points.
55. In conclusion Mr Hayes hoped that the information had been helpful to members. In terms of timescales the strategy has been out for a couple of months, comments are required by the 11th November. Mr Hayes stated that it was a genuine consultation and NDA looked forward

to receiving views on the strategy. He also stressed that there were a lot of issues where NDA generally don't know the answer and community views would make a real contribution. NDA will revise the strategy to incorporate comments and will try to inform people how it has been revised to take into account the comments. Following this the strategy will be submitted to NDA board in December and assuming the board approves it will be submitted to the Government for the Government's approval. So in conclusion, NDA would hope to present it to Government before Christmas for their approval in the first three months of next year, with a view to the strategy coming into effect in April next year or before hand if possible.

56. As an aside Mr Hayes mentioned that the NDA has a requirement to produce an annual plan, which it produced from 1st April this 06, It is also a requirement for the NDA to consult on the annual plan. The draft of the second annual plan has been placed on the NDA website for a 3 month public consultation, hard copies are also available. The plan covers each of the NDA sites and their activities and what NDA plan to do for the financial year from April 2006. Mr Hayes stressed that the annual plan is important to NDA because it is the first year where the plan belongs to the NDA rather than a compilation of previous plans from BNG and UKAEA etc. it is also the first plan that reflects the first year of implementation of the strategy and NDA hope it will be endorsed by Government.
57. **Q: Paul Shawcross:** Mr Shawcross reported that the Unions had submitted its comments to the NDA, but mentioned that things were changing very quickly in the nuclear industry, referring particularly to the Government's announcement that it would sell British Nuclear Group off. Pointing members to slide 11 of the NDA's presentation he asked whether there was now a need for the NDA to quickly develop the industry wide pension scheme, because any sale of British Nuclear Group would result in all the workers not being allowed to be part of the combined pension scheme?
58. **A: David Hayes:** Mr Hayes replied that NDA need to develop the industry wide pension scheme as quickly as possible in order to prepare for competition and are trying to have the scheme in place some time probably within the next 12 to 15 months. He pointed out that NDA was very keen to involve prospect and the other trade unions in the process and reported that NDA had had a very useful meeting with all the trade unions about the strategy down in Warrington a couple of weeks ago where NDA had said it would very much welcome the contribution of the trade unions to its work on developing the industry wide scheme. The potential sale of British Nuclear Group is another significant issue, Mr Hayes' understanding was that the BNFL board had made clear that it desires to sell British Nuclear Group, the issue is therefore currently with Government to determine whether the Government wants to sell BNG or not. It has crucial implications for the NDA and NDA has made it clear that it would want to make very clear its views to Government on a potential sale before such a sale takes place and it is in the process of formulating its views prior to engaging with the Government. One of the potential implications for any sale could be the competition because essentially a sale of British Nuclear Group would be a sale of the contracts which British Nuclear Group currently has for the management and operation of the 15 sites which are now part of the 20 sites within NDA's remit, so it has a massive impact on what NDA is doing and NDA will engage with Government on those issues as well as wanting to develop the industry wide scheme as quickly as possible but recognising it is a complex piece of work which would be wrong to rush.
59. **Q: Cllr N Clarkson:** Cllr Clarkson thanked Mr Hayes for his talk and referred him to slide 8, second bullet point. ' work with local stakeholders to encourage and support activities

benefiting social and economic life around our sites', he asked if there was any reason why NDA couldn't insert on slide 6 for nuclear skills institute, nuclear skills academy, research laboratory and national archive, the word Copeland as opposed to West Cumbria?

60. **A: Richard Mrowicki:** Mr Mrowicki explained that the current situation on the National Nuclear Skills academy and the development of all of the skills initiatives is something which NDA is working closely with the regional development agency and the providers of training and education such as the universities. Where the precise location is of each of these activities is positioned is a matter for further discussion, it will be in West Cumbria, some of them will be in Copeland some of them may well be in Allerdale as well because NDA intend to use the Lakes college as one of the hubs of training and skills development as part of this package. It is definitely West Cumbria but not exclusively Copeland.
61. **Q: David Humphreys:** Mr Humphreys explained that his responsibility is off site emergency planning for the Sellafield site and that the view of the Emergency Planning committee has always been since inception that safety at Sellafield is number one and connected to that is emergency planning, emergency planning is only used when the safety fails. Mr Humphreys reported that he was very interested when the strategy came out to see what it said about safety and emergency planning and he found the word safety appeared about four or five times throughout the document. He noted that it appeared first of all in the NDA presentation but it wasn't mentioned until well into the strategy document. Mr Humphreys stated that he was absolutely staggered to find that the word emergency does not appear in the document at all. He asked the NDA if it should consider whether it should be giving a lead and saying that it expects very high standards of emergency planning at all of its sites. Mr Humphreys stated that he knew the NDA's answer would be 'well that's something for the regulator and law to take on board', but he believes that safety and emergency planning is a culture. The NDA is already talking about efficiency savings and Mr Humphreys continued that not just in the nuclear industry but in the world over, when looking for savings, emergency planning is one of the areas where savings are always found because you say 'well it may never happen', Mr Humphreys referred to events in New Orleans and others. He would have liked to have seen the NDA as the overall regulator laying down the culture of how the sites will be managed in the future, saying something about emergency planning.
62. **A: David Hayes:** Mr Hayes replied that safety and security are absolutely paramount to the NDA, and it is not interested in making cost savings at the risk of prejudicing safety or security in any way. In letters that NDA has written to BNG, Westinghouse and UKAEA asking them to make the savings, NDA has made it absolutely clear that those savings are not to be done in such a way as to prejudice safety and security - they are absolutely fundamental. Mr Hayes continued that the NDA believes that the competition process will increase and enhance safety standards rather than reduce them, He stated that he knew it was a concern of some people that the competition may bring in lower price bidders, he wanted to assure everyone that when NDA bids out the contracts for competition it won't simply be going for the lowest price bids it will be going for the best bids in terms of a number of factors, and has set out a number of criteria for those competition which reflects safety as a priority. He stated that unless people have the right safety performance they won't pre-qualify for the competition.
63. Mr Hayes absolutely agreed with Mr Humphreys that safety and emergency planning are cultural issues, and believed that was very clear at the moment, the NDA does want to work with the contractors to see how it can promote a better culture of safety and security on its

sites. He commented that NDA's safety and security director is Lawrence Williams, who was the former head of NII and felt the NDA had 'the best in the business' to run the proposals from an NDA perspective.

64. **A: Mark Dixon:** Mr Dixon re-iterated that there is no intention by the NDA to look at any savings in those areas, he felt that there were things that can be done differently but that did not necessarily mean doing them worse and the regulator would not allow NDA to do anything like that.
65. **Q: David Humphreys:** Mr Humphreys was delighted to hear that, and wouldn't have expected to hear anything else. His main point was however that it doesn't say that in the strategy and he would like to see a little bit more of that in the strategy rather than not.
66. **A: David Hayes:** Mr Hayes reported that NDA will certainly see how it can reflect that, he did however ask members to consider that it is meant to be a strategic document rather than an operational document but NDA will certainly look to see how it can reflect the comments better in the revision. He felt it was a fair point and one NDA agree with.
67. **Q: David Cook:** Mr Cook said that The Emergency Planning sub committee had asked the NDA to take part in the committee and they had declined to do so, he asked if that in light of the previous reply would NDA re-think the decision?
68. **A: Mark Dixon:-** Mr Dixon replied no, because of the role that NDA play in managing the contract not the contractor and the discussions that it had with the regulator and also using some advice from Lawrence Cook and his past regulator experience, NDA thought it was inappropriate to partake in the committee and provide any form of direction, however, should there be an emergency in the future then once all the emergency actions have been taken NDA will be looking at discussing the recovery from that, that was how NDA saw their input. NDA has an interest in what goes on but certainly has no direction in it.
69. **Q: David Cook:** Mr Cook pointed out that the emergency Planning sub committee was the perfect tool for the NDA to see exactly how emergency planning works.
70. **A: Mark Dixon:** Mr Dixon confirmed that he did see how it is being worked, he received the minutes from the meetings and all the information from it, but considered that it would be incorrect and improper of NDA to be involved in the committee, where it could be seen as perhaps providing the controlling mind.
71. **Chairman:** The Chairman added that the concerns that were raised at the emergency planning meeting and a reason why a member of the NDA had been asked to attend, was because of the funding of recovery phases from emergency planning. The committee were seeking clarification on funding of recovery phases at a meeting and felt there was no-one there to give direction. He continued that on occasions the committee would like to request that NDA come along to clarify areas of concern.
72. **A: Mark Dixon:** Mr Dixon confirmed that based on that specific area of interest the NDA would reconsider.
73. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Mr Hargreaves stated that he had noticed in the NDA document that it was contemplating bringing on contractors who are not fully experienced on the site to allow them to gain experience on the site. Mr Hargreaves continued that if that is a prime contractor with a site licence in his hand it would worry him. He thought the words in the

document didn't reflect NDA's actual intentions and felt they should be clarified because it seems to be giving entirely the wrong message.

74. **A: David Hayes:** Mr Hayes replied that he felt it was a good point, and agreed to look at the wording again. He continued that the intent is part of a bidding process, NDA do have contractors who are managing sites at the moment who have got the best knowledge of those sites, clearly in any competition as they do in the United States for example it is a requirement that access to the sites is given to potential bidders so they can get an understanding of what is required of them if they want to bid for the contract. It was with that in mind that NDA is talking about that philosophy.
75. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Mr Hargreaves stated that this area is unique in the sense that it is the repository for virtually all the radioactive waste, although there might be things in the future that don't exist at the moment, but everything that NDA decide to do on the other sites with the exception of possibly Dounreay could have a very big impact on the Sellafield site and Mr Hargreaves didn't see in the NDA strategy document any analysis. He was sure that the NDA must have done it, but there didn't seem to be any mention of it, even at the most mundane, like 100,000 lorries a year coming down the road for example he felt that there ought to be some consideration of that in the strategy document of the recipient area as well as the donor areas. He also felt it could have quite a large effect on NDA aspirations for a 25 year decommissioning cycle for the Magnox reactors, particularly dealing with the graphite which is now in probably its most compact form and as soon as you take it out of the pressure vessel it will expand in volume by about a factor of three because of its packaging and that has to be dealt with.
76. **A: David Hayes:** Mr Hayes agreed it was a very fair point. He felt that the NDA has addressed the transport issues in more detail in its environmental report and made references there to the number of transport movements particularly around the LLW repository at Drigg. He continued that the NDA is trying to convey work that it has to do over the coming months. He continued that there is a fundamental issue for this area of where the waste goes, most of the LLW does come from the Sellafield site, should Sellafield for example become a national repository for LLW, should it continue to be the Repository at Drigg with its problems of capacity, should NDA look for another site around the UK for ILW should Sellafield become the national interim storage facility, there are longer term questions around the longer term management of ILW and HLW which will flow from the CORWM report and again NDA has not touched on sites there. A number of people have suggested that this region might be the home for any repository, Mr Hayes stated that he wasn't putting that forward as a solution, but it was one of the key things NDA wanted to get through in the strategy. The question to what extent does this area want to or should it become the repository for LLW, ILW etc', is a massive question and NDA would very much welcome views on it.
77. **Q: Ron Hargreaves:** Mr Hargreaves felt that there were other issues tied up within that for example the business of 100 years or 25 years or whenever. He commented that one thing on our side was radioactive decay. If you wait 100 years a major contributor (Cobalt 60) to the activity of the pressure vessel will have decayed by a factor of one million, so where you may have difficulty handling it now, in 100 years time you could probably just put them in the ground somewhere. It is things like that that Mr Hargreaves felt could have done with more detail.

78. **Q: Elaine Woodburn:** Cllr Woodburn suggested it would be extremely difficult to answer a question like that based on the information to date and she felt it was too important a question to answer with just the information the committee has. She felt it was something that would require a lot of community consultation and ultimately the community need to say it accepts it. She didn't think anyone around the table or any other organisations have the right to say. Views can be given but ultimately it's the whole community who make the decision on whether it wants to be the repository area or not.
79. **Cllr Woodburn** asked Mr Hayes about his comment on the use of seed corn funding. She asked if it was money that the NDA has specifically, or is it money that will only become available if there are efficiencies made on the work that has to be done on clean up?
80. **A: David Hayes:** Mr Hayes replied that it is money that NDA will find from its budget in particular from the re-allocation of funding this year. At the moment the projected spend for this year isn't as high as NDA's total funding allocation. It is looking at ways of re-allocating some of the funding, some of which will go to socio and economic development in particular the skills agenda this year.
81. **Q: Elaine Woodburn:** Cllr Woodburn commented that she thought the strategy document was one of the easiest documents she had ever read, which surprised her because she expected it to be a lot more technical, she felt there were certain bits that could be better, but the majority of the document is an easy read and she hoped the NDA would continue along that line. She referred to a meeting she had sat in with NDA and a representative that had come over from Hanford. One of the points that he made was how positive the Hanford community is and Cllr Woodburn thought the community in this area has a lot of positives it is managing those positives, as possible negative impacts start having influence. One of the things NDA said in the strategy which she welcomed is the cleaning up of the highest hazards, she continued that now the perception of people outside of the area is that it is such a dangerous site, if NDA was now saying it is the first thing it is going to prioritise then she asked what it was going to do hand in hand with that which will help the image and the stigma of the area that goes along with it. She felt it was going to involve a new image a lot of marketing which will require resources and she felt as part of its responsibilities the NDA should help the community sell the fact that it is cleaning up to the rest of the county if not worldwide.
82. **A: Richard Mrowicki:** Mr Mrowicki answered that with the help of its contractors who are doing an excellent job in cleaning up NDA will do everything it can to promote the success of decommissioning and its impact on the area and the environment.
83. **Q: Martin Forward:** Martin Forward referred to a slide relating to AGR fuel and asked if it referred to all AGR fuel contracted for reprocessing or fuel contracted for storage?
84. **A: Richard Mrowicki:** Mr Mrowicki stated that it specifically relates to the fuel that is beyond reprocessing in other words it's the long term management of spent fuel arising from the AGR power stations after Thorp has closed ultimately and particularly following any potential extension of the AGR power stations by British Energy, so it is a big issue in terms of managing fuel arising from those power stations as they go towards their working life
85. **Q: Martin Forward:** Mr Forward thought that apart from fuel arisings from any extensions to the stations, all the other fuel was already contracted one way or the other?

86. **A: Richard Mrowicki:** Mr Mrowicki confirmed that was correct, it is contracted for either reprocessing or for storage.
87. **Q: Martin Forward:** Mr Forwood asked what the position was with the European investigation into the NDA?
88. **A: David Hayes:** Mr Hayes replied that the Government hoped to receive a positive verdict from the European commission before Christmas.
89. **Q: Observer:** It was mentioned that CORWM is looking at the options for the long term storage of waste. The NDA also mentioned that it was looking at various options. What progress has the NDA made?
90. **A: David Hayes:** Mr Hayes replied that NDA will be conducting some in house work on the issue to evaluate what the right options should be, it is also looking for the views of stakeholders to what they think the best options should be. NDA is running a National Stakeholder event in Manchester on the 17th and 18th October, at that event which will comprise of representatives from all the local stakeholder groups, NDA wants to put a number of key critical issues on the table which it believes requires further in depth work, one of those issues is waste management particularly of both LLW and ILW.
91. **Chairman:** The Chairman commented that the committee would be pulling together the questions that had been asked. He stated members of the public could put forward their views directly to the NDA or if they wanted to feed them in through the WCSSG process the committee would be happy to accommodate that.
92. On the issue of the National stakeholder dialogue which will be taking place on the 17th and 18th the Chairman confirmed there were six members representing the WCSSG at that forum, so the committee could be assured that it would have a strong voice to look at whatever options were put on the table.
93. **ITEM 6 – BRITISH NUCLEAR GROUP REPORT**
94. Pete Lutwyche apologised that Barry Snelson was unable to attend the meeting as he was chairing the top tier nuclear safety committee. In line with the Chairman's request he intended to take the report as read and highlight a couple of key issues from it and then a few key points that had happened since the report.
95. In terms of the report itself, Mr Lutwyche referred to the safety section where there was a piece on the HS&Q and overall improvement plans, he highlighted that within the next week or so BNG will become full members of an organisation called the World Association of Nuclear Operators (WANO), BNG is very proud to become part of that organisation formally, it is the organisation that provides best practice and high standards for reactors around the world and BNG will be the first non reactor site to become a member of that group. One of the things BNG is linking its safety improvements to is how it meets the standards that WANO presents.
96. The key feature of the report Mr Lutwyche highlighted was the achievements relating to the clean up that has been in progress around the site. Some particular successes since the last meeting were that BNG disposed of all the zinc bromide from the site, an orphan waste stream that previously had no route.

97. Mr Lutwyche reported that some good progress has been made on B38, which is the wet fuel cladding silo storage facility, there has been a significant amount of clean up from historic spillage which will facilitate the introduction of the ultimate retrieval machines for that facility and also BNG has announced just today (ie: 6/10/05) the work to install a new crane on the facility which was a mammoth construction task completed successfully without incident. Mr Lutwyche reported that BNG is very proud of that achievement.
98. Moving onto Calder Hall Mr Lutwyche reported that the NII has given the go ahead for decommissioning to commence following some extensive preparatory work and public consultation, it is only the third time that level of permission has been given since the legislation came into being in 1999.
99. He reminded members and observers that representatives from the Calder Hall project were in attendance at the meeting to talk on the proposal for demolition of the cooling towers later this year or perhaps early into the new year. It would be a significant milestone for the site and would make a significant change to the skyline.
100. Mr Lutwyche continued that BNG is working very hard on the site to improve its efficiency around waste management and treatment of wastes, working hard to increase packing fractions in the waste that it disposes of and also where it can to clean waste up so it can be disposed of in a lower segregated level, so it can clean intermediate level waste to dispose of as low level waste, or low level waste to dispose of as free release, BNG is working to enhance its successes on that front.
101. On the Sealine recovery project Mr Lutwyche reported that BNG expect, weather permitting, that by the end of this financial year all of the sealine recovery operation will be complete.
102. On a safety point Mr Lutwyche stated that the group that look after the decommissioning of the original pond for storing the fuel from the Windscale piles passed four years without a lost time accident during the last period.
103. Mr Lutwyche proposed to quickly highlight some key features since the issue of the report, A key milestone that BNG had achieved was the delivery of Life Cycle Baseline to the NDA on schedule at the end of September.
104. The report mentioned that Magnox Reprocessing was expected to re-start at the end of September, BNG was hopeful that it would get confirmation that the direction had been complied with from the regulators tomorrow (ie: 7/10/05) and it will then start the re-phase after that, so the re-start was looking more likely to start slightly into October.
105. The recovery plans for Thorp are progressing to programme and BNG is expecting a full re-start of the plant subject to all of the approvals and NDA considerations etc., in around about February.
106. In conclusion Mr Lutwyche reported that the most important thing that had occurred since the last meeting was the boards desire to sell British Nuclear Group, which would now become a matter for consultation with key stakeholders, regulators, NDA and others, in culminating with the recommendations with the Secretary of State who will then make a decision on whether it goes forward or not.

107. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood referred to the reports content on Thorp's recovery and highlighted that the report referred to 'engineering options' he asked if the preferred option had been chosen.
108. **A: Peter Lutwyche:** Mr Lutwyche confirmed that BNG was still in discussion with the NDA and the regulators to finalise the preferred option, he thought it had been worked down to a couple of final solutions, however there is still a little bit of work to do to actually settle on the option to be followed.
109. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood asked if he had an idea of when that would be?
110. **A: Peter Lutwyche:** Mr Lutwyche thought it would be by the end of this month, (ie: October).
111. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood referred to the contract part of the report, where it referred to three Performance Based Incentives being on hold, he asked which three PBI's they were?
112. **A: Peter Lutwyche:** Mr Lutwyche could not be specific without the details in front of him, but stated that they were things like the target for shearing and dissolving fuel and other associated operational targets. He continued that BNG was in discussion with the NDA about how to deal with those targets for the remainder of the year.
113. **Chairman:** The Chairman referred to the comments on the sale of BNG, and stated that it would have been nice if there was some consultation before the board made the announcement as it had caused quite a shock throughout the community. The Chairman went on to say the community seemed to be dealing regularly over the last few years with shocks and reading most of the announcements unfortunately through the media.
114. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood referred to HLW plants on page three of the report quoting, 'The shortfall in production has predominantly been due to mechanical failures and the need for a thorough review of operating and maintenance procedures to ensure optimisation of environmental impacts of our operations'. He failed to understand the difference between operations and maintenance procedures and asked why that should have played a part in the production?
115. **A: Peter Lutwyche:** Mr Lutwyche explained that when BNG was reviewing some of the procedures there are 3 states of operation for the Vitrification Plant, there is operation, shut down and standby whereby the plant hasn't been shut down but it is in a standby, ready to operate phase. What BNG was trying to do was make absolutely sure that the procedures related to those phases were clearly aligned so it was clear in which procedures which phase they referred to and in order to take a prudent and conservative decision on operating the plant whilst they were doing that review BNG did not process any glass through the plant until that review was complete.
116. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood asked how that impinged on the actual production?
117. **A: Peter Lutwyche:** Mr Lutwyche replied that if you are not clear on what phase the plant is in when you are operating it against certain instructions there could be an environmental issue and an environmental performance issue.
118. **ITEM 7 – UKAEA REPORT**

119. Mr Mann began his report by referring to the UKAEA's interactions with the nuclear regulator NII, it has, since the report was written, submitted its safety case for Pile one which is a significant milestone. The NII is currently assessing the safety case.
120. On a similar theme, the NII in its report had drawn attention to shortcomings in UKAEA's safety case for the shielded examination facility, which had been identified during assessment earlier in the year. Mr Mann reported that UKAEA has taken the concerns very seriously both at site and company level. UKAEA has been asked by the NII to look at the adequacy of its processes for safety case production, in the general sense and to reconsider the application of those in the specific case of the B13 safety case.
121. The review is ongoing it is not yet complete but UKAEA intend to present its findings to the NII early next month following further consideration by its nuclear safety committee.
122. UKAEA has strengthened its team working on the issues including appointing a co-ordinating project manager to pull together the various improvement actions into a comprehensive and properly resourced plan, such that it can commit to making the necessary improvements. UKAEA's tenant in the facility NEXIA solutions is working closely with UKAEA on the programme and the activities of both teams includes addressing the improvement notices that the NII has issued to both of the organisations and the responses there will be provided as part of the response to the regulator in November.
123. On a more positive note Mr Mann confirmed that in common with British Nuclear Group UKAEA has submitted its revised Life Cycle Baseline to the NDA. The review of its baseline has concentrated on the period from 2008 to 2015 and has resulted in a number of refinements and improvements. Overall the site strategy hasn't changed but UKAEA has reviewed the detail of its schedules and estimates and has reduced some timescales in the programme of decommissioning. The document itself is largely in electronic format, UKAEA believe it is in a much more user friendly form than it was previously and it provides links by which people reading it can navigate around the various elements of the plan and understand it better. Mr Mann believed it is a significantly better product than the previous Life Cycle Baseline submissions and in November UKAEA anticipate the NDA publishing its baseline along with those from all the other sites and they should be available in the public domain on that sort of timescale.

124. **ITEM 8 – NII REPORT**

125. Derek Lacey introduced himself and explained he was representing Peter Watson. Peter had described at the last meeting how NII is re-organising to set up two regulatory units rather than the previous one. Dr Lacey heads the unit which regulates the remediation and decommissioning activities at the Sellafield site.
126. Dr Lacey proposed to speak briefly on some of the significant events that had occurred since the report had been published. He began by making some general observations about safety improvement initiatives on the Sellafield site. There have been a number of events which have caused concern related to Thorp Product Finishing and Storage and High Level Waste Plants. What NII observed as the regulator is that BNGSL has responded to that by addressing specific issues but also looking to see how they can make more broad improvements on the site to prevent occurrence of these sorts of events. That is an initiative that NII support and which it will be taking an interest in over the coming months.

127. NII also felt it appropriate to develop an independent view on safety on the site and has decided to put together a team of inspectors drawn not only from the NII but other parts of HSE to take a stand back review of safety performance, NII is still defining the terms of reference for that team inspection and is expecting to be able to report on that in the next planning year.
128. Moving on Dr Lacey continued that specifically on Thorp, there are three separate NII activities, the first is the formal investigation which will inform NII's enforcement action, that is still progressing and the investigation is likely to continue for several months. In the meantime two improvement notices have been issued one on instructions and recording and the other on maintenance and leak detection.
129. The second and third activities that NII has are concerned with seeking to understand the technical issues for the failures and understanding the different options for restart so that NII will be in a position to permission any proposals which are brought forward.
130. The final remark Dr Lacey made on Thorp was that under the new regime there has been considerable effort allocated to respond to requests under the Freedom of Information Act on the Thorp event.
131. Dr Lacey moved on to report on the Product Finishing Line and Storage Facility. This is the plant where NII directed a shutdown of the plant until a satisfactory safety case could be constructed for restart. Dr Lacey confirmed a huge amount of work has been done over the last few months by BNGSL to pull together a review of safety and BNGSL has now applied to NII for a consent to restart. NII is working through the permission process at the back end of this week and may well be in a position to grant permission subject to its final review of those proposals.
132. The final Sellafield topic Dr Lacey reported on was on progress against Legacy Ponds and Silos. NII has been encouraged to see realistic plans and critical path analysis for decommissioning of Legacy Ponds and Silos in line with the NII specifications, NII is also pleased to see some physical progress on the plant with preparatory work and enabling work being carried out in a safe manner.
133. Dr Lacey reported that there were some concerns with the transition to NDA ownership over the level of funding being provided for activities on the Legacy Ponds and Silos, NII raised it as an issue and BNGSL, NDA have been working to resolve the funding concerns and largely those issues have been addressed. NII is optimistic that the delays that have occurred because of those uncertainties over funding should be prevented with the new Life Cycle Baseline that has recently been produced.
134. For the UKAEA site at Windscale the two items that Dr Lacey proposed to refer to had already been referred to in Peter Mann's presentation, that is the two improvement notices, one on UKAEA and the other on NEXIA solutions and the other was a concern over the adequacy of the safety case for the shielded examination facility.
135. **Q: Paul Shawcross:** Mr Shawcross asked what discussions NII had with British Nuclear Group board over the sale of British Nuclear Group?
136. **A: Derek Lacey:** Dr Lacey reported that no discussions had taken place with British Nuclear Group Board over the Sale, it is something that NII is very much aware of and what NII has been doing is putting in place the resources and the capacity it needs to respond to

changes at all the sites in the UK as a result of the NDA initiatives. It may be that if there is a sale NII needs to bring those arrangements into play sooner than anticipated.

137. **Q: Paul Shawcross:** Mr Shawcross asked if it would be fair to say NII is disappointed that British Nuclear Group site licence holder has had no discussions with NII regarding its decision to sell?
138. **A: Derek Lacey:** Dr Lacey replied: 'That would be putting words in my mouth'.
139. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood referred to the NII report where it states that NII does not have the resources to carry out a detailed assessment of all the COSR's, he asked if that meant that some received attention and others didn't?
140. **A: Derek Lacey:** Dr Lacey replied that all periodic safety reviews are assessed. NII has in place a system where it prioritises the periodic safety review on the basis of the significance of the plant. Where NII sometimes struggle is in being able to deal with them as quickly as it would like. Dr Lacey reported that he was not aware of any occasions where NII had not been able to get the resource it needed to complete assessment work.
141. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood referred Dr Lacy to the sealine pipebridge refurbishment part of his report. BNG has provided to NII two contingency arrangements, should the integrity of the sea discharge route be compromised during implementation of the project. He asked what the two contingency arrangements were and pointed out that there would surely only be one contingency and that would be to stop the operation of the pipe?
142. **A: Derek Lacey:** Dr Lacey commented that it was a very detailed question and was unable to answer at the meeting.
143. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood asked for a written response?
144. **A: Derek Lacey:** Dr Lacey confirmed he would provide a written response.
145. **Chairman:** The Chairman asked Dr Lacey to provide the response through the secretariat who would forward it onto Mr Forwood and publish it on the website.
146. **Andy Mayall:** Mr Mayall offered a response. He continued that in summary the contingency planning would depend on whether there were one or two pipelines affected, there are two pipes that go over the pipebridge. If one is affected then obviously the discharge will be diverted through the remaining line. If both lines are affected then as Mr Forwood had suggested there are plans to halt operations on site whilst a solution is sought for the pipe.
147. **ITEM 9 – REPORT FROM THE ENVIRONMENT AGENCY**
148. Mr Mayall introduced himself and explained that he worked for the Environment Agency as the co-ordinator of the Agency's Sellafield team based at Penrith. In line with previous reports Mr Mayall intended to take his report as read and would summarise a few highlights.
149. Mr Mayall proposed to touch on three of EA's general roles, the first is related to its core regulatory duties which it is required to do by statute and then he proposed to talk a little about an increasing part of its work which is working in partnership with various

organisations to achieve improved environmental outcomes and then he would touch on emergency preparedness.

150. In terms of the core work, Mr Mayall drew members attention to page six of his report which gave a summary of where EA was in terms of the authorisations which the three sites possess. EA issued a new authorisation to Sellafield 12 months ago, and has been monitoring progress with the implementation of that over the last 12 months. Mr Mayall highlighted that the site is now producing a whole series of what EA is calling best practicable means cases or environmental cases for each of the major plants on the site and the intention ultimately is that these would be parallel to the safety cases which have been present for the facilities for quite some time. It is the intention to use those cases to drive the environmental improvements at the various facilities on the site and also they are a means of the site setting down a demonstration of how they will minimise waste arisings, minimise waste discharges and apply the best possible techniques to measurement etc.
151. Over the last 12 months EA included in the new authorisation a raft of improvement conditions. The deadlines for quite a few of those have passed over the past 12 months and all of those deadlines have been met and the various submissions made to EA. EA has assessed those or is assessing them.
152. Mr Mayall moved on to highlight the new requirement for an integrated waste strategy which appears in the authorisation it is also now a requirement of the NDA as part of the Life Cycle Baseline documentation.
153. Mr Mayall reported that the Sellafield site has applied for a permit under the Pollution, Prevention and Control regulations which deals with non radioactive discharges and various other environmental issues. The application was submitted in August and EA is now taking the application forward.
154. EA has recently consulted on a review of the LLW repository at Drigg's RSA 93 authorisations, the consultation ended at the beginning of September and EA is now into the phase of considering all of the responses that were made to the consultation and a decision document is planned for January.
155. Moving on to report on Windscale, Mr Mayall reported that Windscale has been through a similar process recently and said that this was a bit further advanced than the review of the LLW repository at Drigg and the decision document should be ready very shortly and submitted to Ministers for their comment.
156. Referring members to page 8 of his report, Mr Mayall proposed to touch on a couple of incidents. Firstly, sealine 3 which is one of the two operational sea pipelines. As a result of a routine test carried out on the 15th September some damage was found in the pipeline in the form of a very small slit. A repair has now been made to the pipe, Mr Mayall reported that whilst the repair was being carried out the discharge was diverted into the other of the two lines.
157. EA has looked at the environmental monitoring data and there are no abnormal trends which can be attributed to that.
158. The next incident was regarding a plant limit breach at the Vitrification plant. When EA introduced the new authorisation 12 months ago, it introduced a new set of limits (a lower tier set of limits) to the site which dealt with individual facilities as opposed to the site as a

whole and one of these limits has been breached for the Vitrification plant, the limit concerned is a very small fraction of the overall site limit so in terms of impact on the environment it is very very small, but EA has been following up the various other compliance aspects of that particular incident and will be taking a decision very shortly on enforcement action.

159. EA issued an enforcement notice back in June for various findings in relation to a team inspection it carried out back in February. These findings related mainly to management arrangements dealing with how liquid waste is minimised at source and various other issues which were listed on page ten of the EA report, Mr Mayall continued that EA was very pleased to say that the improvements that it had suggested are being taken forward now.
160. Concluding his report on core regulatory work, Mr Mayall moved on to report that an increasing part of EA work is working in partnership with various agencies and EA continues to devote effort to working with NII, NDA and others on the various long term and near term work plans.
161. In conclusion Mr Mayall moved onto emergency preparedness. Recovery planning had been mentioned earlier and Mr Mayall stressed that is something that is supported strongly within the Environment Agency and EA has applied some resource to taking that forward with Cumbria County Council and others. EA was very pleased to hear that the NDA is now taking an interest in recovery planning.
162. **Q: Martin Forwood:** Mr Forwood referred Mr Mayall to page 9 of his report. Under the Thorp section, it read: ‘the potential knock-on effects of prolonged Thorp shutdown’, Mr Forwood asked Mr Mayall to explain what the Agency sees as the potential knock on effects?
163. **A: Andy Mayall:** Mr Mayall replied that it was just really to ensure itself that there were no potential knock-on effects, examples could be the build up of fuel in the ponds for example and any implications for operations on the other parts of the site. Mr Mayall stressed that so far it was fair to say EA has not found any significant knock-on effects on other areas of the site.
164. **ITEM 10 – COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT COORDINATING SUB COMMITTEE REPORT**
165. The committee held meetings monthly in April, May, June, August and September.
166. Cllr Woodburn began by reminding everybody that the committee was not formed to make a response to the consultation it was formed to look at creating a process to ensure the community has an opportunity to be engaged and have their views heard and fed directly into the NDA.
167. She reported that there were 4 issues identified by the community as the main priorities and they were the issues the committee would run with. The first one is the ‘Future of the Sellafield site’ which Cllr Woodburn felt fitted in very well with the comments made in the NDA strategy, so the committee would ensure both would tie in together.
168. The first consultation will be on the website week commencing 17th October so Cllr Woodburn urged everyone to go to the website and have a look at the document and to register onto the website for future consultations. She also stressed that if people were interested but did not have access to the website to let the secretariat know who would

endeavour to provide the relevant information. She reported that the intention is then to hold a workshop with organisations and interested members of the community to talk through the details of the framework document.

169. One of the issues chosen for consultation is socio economic impacts and Cllr Woodburn felt that as circumstances change that is going to become more important. Cllr Woodburn felt that as consultation begins on socio economic impacts and it becomes more important to the local community, part of the role of the site stakeholder group should be to oversee what is happening on the socio economic side as well as monitoring what is happening on the site, Cllr Woodburn thought the committee needed to take the opportunity to ensure there is a regular item on the agenda and feedback is forthcoming through the NDA as to how it is fulfilling its responsibility and feedback is forthcoming on what the West Cumbria Strategic Forum is doing. She re-iterated that the committee needs to keep an eye on the socio economic side as well as having to keep an eye on everything else.

170. Moving on Cllr Woodburn reported that the CECSC has new membership and she thanked previous members for their input. She continued that a lot of work had gone into the committee and she wanted it recorded to thank the secretariat for all its hard work. She was sure the hard work would pay off and was confident that the process would help the community have a voice.

171. **Chairman:** The Chairman re-iterated that community engagement is important, stakeholder engagement is what the WCSSG is about and it was something it wanted to spend a lot of time on and get right. He believed taking on the socio economic impact was an important thing and he welcomed the committee taking that role on and keeping a close eye on it.

172. **Q: Marjorie Higham:** Mrs Higham asked if the meetings could be attended by members of the public or if they were private meetings?

173. **A: Elaine Woodburn:** Cllr Woodburn confirmed they were open to the public.

174. **Q: Marjorie Higham:** Mrs Higham asked if they were the last Friday in the month.

175. **A: Elaine Woodburn:** Cllr Woodburn confirmed that was the case, she also reported that the committee had put the flexibility into the terms of reference that if there is any information that is commercially sensitive, the committee will move into a process whereby members of the public or the press would be asked to leave, she felt this was standard procedure. She re-iterated that if there were any members of the public who wished to attend they were more than welcome. She confirmed the events were all listed on the calendar of events.

176. **ITEM 11 – ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SUB COMMITTEE**

177. Professor Haywood began his report by stating that the Environmental Health sub committee had met on the 27th May. It had met in public and although the attendance by the public was not huge, it was very beneficial to the meeting.

178. The draft minutes of the meeting were included in the reports to this meeting and Professor Haywood proposed to highlight one or two items.

179. The sub committee received a preliminary report on the site operators programme which measures Sellafield related activity in the environment in 2004. The most significant change

from 2003 to 2004 was a fall in the annual radiation dose to individuals who consume very large quantities of seafood. It is estimated that their dose has been reduced by about 8% largely as a consequence of an 83% reduction in Technetium 99 discharges. A more detailed report on last years monitoring programme is anticipated at the next meeting of the sub committee on the 24th November. Comparable reports from regulators should also be available by that time.

180. A presentation had been received from Mr Tim Parker on proposed principals and objectives by which the monitoring programme will be guided in the future and that was also described in the minutes.
181. Although more is known about the health effects of low level radiation than almost any other environmental influence, understanding continues to be refined as scientists take account of new evidence or re-analysing old evidence. The recommendations of the International commission on radiation protection guide the scientific community in this field, Professor Haywood reported that this year they conducted a consultation on a revision of their recommendations and Professor Jones presented their proposals to the sub committee meeting a copy of which appeared as appendix one of the minutes. Prof Haywood concluded that the sub committee expected to revisit the subject when the recommendations are finally published if not before.
182. **Chairman:** The Chairman welcomed the fact that the committee was now open to the public which is how he wanted all the committees to operate. He also welcomed the fact that some members of the public did attend and made a useful contribution to that meeting and he hoped to encourage more of that.

183. ITEM 12 – EMERGENCY PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

184. Mr Cook began his report by stating that the committee held its meeting on 14th July and that it was still not in the public domain, but Mr Cook assured members that at the next meeting which would be posted onto the calendar, members of the public would be welcome.
185. The sub committee received reports from British Nuclear Group, UKAEA, and Cumbria County Council emergency planning unit on exercises that had been held since the last report.
186. The committee was also provided with a forthcoming programme of emergency exercises, it was noted that the programme included two exercises of the whole site and involved the sounding of the site siren.
187. As had been stated earlier Mr Cook reported that the NDA declined an invitation to attend the meeting, but the committee had welcomed a member from the highways agency which it saw as an important member of the emergency planning committee due to the fact that the weather in the last few years has contributed to a lot of problems on the roads which would impinge upon emergency vehicles entering and leaving the site.
188. The committee had also received a presentation on the site evacuation that had taken place on 11th January and the lessons learnt from that, this was with reference to the weather, in particular the high winds which caused congestion to the highways with members of the site leaving at the same time. Mr Cook reported that the learning that had come out of that was that in future the emergency control room would be manned and it would phase the evacuation of the site.

189. Mr Cook concluded by stating that the next meeting would be held in public and members of the public were welcome to attend.
190. **Q: Marjorie Higham:** Mrs Higham referred to the NDA declining an invitation to attend the emergency planning sub committee, she stated that she felt that emergency planning was extremely important to the area and she was very surprised that the NDA had declined the invitation.
191. **A: Mark Dixon:** Mr Dixon replied that as he had said earlier in the meeting, the NDA had not wanted to appear to be the controlling mind and that the initial actions required during an emergency are a matter between the Site Licence Company and the regulators, so NDA did not wish to get in between that, however as the Chairman had pointed out earlier Mr Dixon continued that it may be prudent that for longer term planning and financing of that to provide a member of the NDA to speak on that. He endeavoured to discuss it with the NDA safety and security director and consider it.
192. Mr Cook added that regarding the evacuation of the site during high winds the sub committee welcomed the fact that the site now has an evacuation policy from the site. Also at the meeting it was suggested the site should be asked to look at a policy for getting people onto the site in a quick and speedy manner should security events dictate, as when the security level lifted. Mr Cook re-iterated that the work done so far was very welcomed.

193. ITEM 13 – WINDSCALE SUB COMMITTEE

194. The Chairman introduced item 13 by explaining that the Windscale sub committee was one of the new committees that has just been established, the first meeting was on the 6th September, the new Chairman of that committee is Ranald Stewart however he was unable to attend the WCSSG meeting, but by knowing that a Vice Chairman was also appointed at that meeting which was Ron Hargreaves who was in attendance to present the report.
195. Mr Hargreaves began by explaining that the report was brief given it was the first meeting. He reported that the meeting had been an extremely good meeting because people had contributed. It was held in public and the public did attend and a Chairman was elected.
196. The committee had a useful discussion centred around a presentation from Peter Mann on what is currently going on on the site, that discussion is going to be followed up in early November with a site visit from all members of the committee visiting the site to get some 'eyes on' experience of what is going on on the ground.
197. Mr Hargreaves continued that out of the discussion there were one or two items that were really quite valuable, things to be looked at in the future such as the socio economic plans and others which were highlighted in the report.
198. **Chairman:** The Chairman thanked Mr Hargreaves for the report, and suggested that as members of the sub committee were invited to visit the UKAEA site it would be appropriate to offer the invitation to other members of the WCSSG.
199. **A: Peter Mann:** Mr Mann confirmed he was more than happy to accommodate other members of the wider groups.
200. **Chairman:** The Chairman asked the secretariat to circulate the date of the visit so members wishing to attend can express an interest.

201. ITEM 14 – LOW LEVEL WASTE REPOSITORY SUB COMMITTEE

202. Cllr Brown reported that the LLW sub committee had convened three meetings to date, and she proposed to give members a flavour of what the committee is about and who makes up its membership.
203. There are a lot of members from the WCSSG represented on the sub committee, several parish council members, BNG, Environment Agency, NII, Copeland Borough Council, NDA, UKAEA and Cumbria County Council members and officers.
204. Cllr Brown stated that the committee has been set up to address the issues that effect the local community and she was very pleased to say that the local community have attended and there was a good track record on public attendance. She extended an invitation to members of the public if they are interested to go along to the meetings.
205. Moving on Cllr Brown reported that the areas addressed so far are mainly based around on-site activities that effect the local community and the committee has received presentations from the NDA on its draft strategy with the emphasis on the Low Level Waste site at Drigg.
206. The Environment Agency has also given presentations which have been very informative.
207. The committee has also looked at specific areas to address, such as the screening of the LLW repository site, the transport through the villages of Holmrook and Drigg, the planning applications. Cllr Brown reported that the committee had arranged for some new road signs because it felt that the original ones were not descriptive enough and also the weight tonnage onto the site had altered slightly over the last few years. The committee also looked at road and pathway improvements and the cleaning of drainage and gully's in the area. Those have been passed on now to the highways engineer of Cumbria County Council to be addressed.
208. The road situation referred to in the LLW report, may be included in a planning application, as it looks as though there might be more transport going through the village of Drigg, although Cllr Brown was very much aware, that one member had said their preference was to have nothing coming through the village, Cllr Brown stated that the committee do take remarks like that on board and it was important to try and get the balance right, probably improve the rail network into the site.
209. Referring to the screening, Cllr Brown reported that there was a lot of damage to the trees on the site during the gales and also for the last 15 years there has been planned thinning to replace the coniferous trees. She suspected that there would be some areas that would not be adequately screened for some years as it would take some time for new trees to grow.
210. The committee had discussed the option of fencing but the local community felt it was inappropriate.
211. Cllr Brown stated that the committee had not indulged in any real discussion on coastal erosion or any issues like that, she did feel that with the future of the LLW repository at Drigg being as uncertain as it is there would be plenty of issues cropping up in the next few months.
212. **David Cook**, Mr Cook reminded the NDA and the Environment Agency that the Low Level Waste Site at Drigg is no longer referred to as just Drigg. He referred to the new road signs

being changed which reflected the name of the site and felt it would be nice if everyone could refer to it as the Low Level Waste Repository.

213. **Q: Marjorie Higham:** Mrs Higham was very pleased that the sub committee is concentrating on the problems at the Low Level Waste Repository at Drigg as she felt no-one has taken a lot of interest in it over the years. She was sad that one of the meetings coincided with another of the meetings and she had to send her husband to one on her behalf. She could see from the programme that they are not overlapping again, which she was happy about. She took the opportunity to mention that there is a planning application with Cumbria County Council regarding the higher stacking and comments needed to be forwarded by 7th November 05.

214. Cllr Brown concluded that the committee is taking on board very much the issues raised by the community and it would continue to represent the community to the best of its ability.

215. **ITEM 15 – DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING**

216. The Chairman wanted to thank all the presenters for the way they had presented their reports to fulfil the new requirements of the committee. Although the reports were short the detail was available for people to find and to read and he hoped that members and observers would agree that it was the format to use for future meetings. He felt meetings in the past were quite lengthy and that it was far more important to put time into questions coming from the public or views of the public and members of the committee.

217. He thanked everyone for their attendance and reported that the next gathering/event of the West Cumbria Sites Stakeholder Group would be Thursday 5th January 06 at the Oval Centre in Workington.

218. Any views members had on what format the 5th January meeting should take would be welcomed and should be sent to the secretariat for consideration.

219. The next scrutiny meeting of the WCSSG where reports will be required will be on Thursday 6th April, venue to be decided.